

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-10 are pending.
2. All pending claims are rejected.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: tree diagram 110 in Figure 5. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to because Figure 5 is (a) in French and (b) of such a low resolution as to render the text generally illegible. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing

Art Unit: 2159

should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites “a second mechanism for raising, when all of the nodes at a level of a current node associated with a current zone are validated based on the level indicators of the nodes of the tree diagram, a validated

Art Unit: 2159

status for a node of the tree display, to a level higher than the level of the current node.”

It appears that this language is attempting to find its support in the Specification at page 8, lines 6-11. It does not appear, however, that the claim language comports with this disclosure. Particularly, the node whose validated status is raised does not necessarily need to be the “node defined by a set of nodes at a lower level” as disclosed in the Specification.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what is meant by “zones with tabs” in the limitation beginning “wherein, the display manager is configured to concurrently display. . .” The use of the word “with” suggests a relationship between zones and tabs that is not clear; the relevant disclosure, particularly Figure 5 of the drawings, would appear to suggest that the zones are related only to a single tab.

9. The following claim language proposed by Examiner would overcome both of the above-stated rejections:

1. A computer system for managing composite documents in multi-user mode, including:
  - one or more server devices including:
    - a processor device for processing document data;

Art Unit: 2159

a document data display manager coupled to a display screen; and  
a document user rights manager coupled to the processor device,  
wherein, the processor device is configured to:

generate an object model, including a plurality of classes,  
structured to include a content pointer, a level indicator, an access mechanism, a  
validation mechanism, and a validation indicator, and

create and maintain in a data store a document in the form of a set  
of object model class instances,

wherein, the display manager is configured to concurrently display on the  
display screen a tree diagram of the document, ~~and a plurality of zones with tabs~~  
for the document, and a plurality of tabs, each level of the tree diagram being  
identified according to a level indicator, each of the plurality of zones  
corresponding to a node of the tree diagram and further providing contents of the  
class instances existing in the corresponding node of the tree diagram, and a tab  
of the plurality of tabs corresponding to the plurality of zones being displayed,

wherein, the processor is configured to only authorize access to the  
document according to access rights of a user concerned determined by the  
document user rights manager,

wherein, if the document is accessed, the processor device is configured  
to only authorize validation of a zone displayed for the document according to  
validation rights of the user concerned, as determined by the document user  
rights manager,

wherein, the display manager includes a first mechanism for concurrently  
modifying the display on the display screen of the zone and the display of the  
corresponding node in the tree diagram according to status of the validation of  
the zone, and a second mechanism ~~for raising~~, when all of the sibling nodes at a  
level of a current node associated with a current zone are validated based on the  
level indicators of the nodes of the tree diagram, for validating a ~~validated~~ status  
~~for of a parent node of the current node of the tree display, to a level higher than~~  
~~the level of the current node~~,

whereas, when a head of the tree diagram is validated, the processor  
device is configured to authorize signature for an entirety of the document by a  
user having corresponding signature rights, the processor device being further

Art Unit: 2159

configured to transmit the signed document to a computer device for display thereon.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claims 1-10 are allowable over the prior art of record.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record teaches document rights managers that operate on a top-down basis, wherein rights that are defined for a user at a higher-level node, are applied for the user at a lower-level child node. The present invention, however, aggregates the validations of child nodes to validate a parent node. This is non-obvious insofar as it clearly conflicts with the earlier practices, and does not comport to the security framework as established by the prior art of record.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments, filed 12 August 2008, with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 103(a) of Claims 1-10 have been fully considered and are persuasive, and the rejections are withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM SPIELER whose telephone number is (571) 270-3883. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday, 11 AM - 5 PM Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trujillo can be reached on (571) 272-3677. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2159

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Spieler/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2159

/James Trujillo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2159